UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,267	06/27/2008	Hugh Thomson	GHL-100US	4535
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 01/19/201 STIA	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 980	CE DA 10402	GABLER, PHILIP F		
VALLEY FOR	GE, PA 19482		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3636	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/19/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/567,267	THOMSON, HUGH
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip Gabler	3636
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period varieties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 December</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12 and 14-16 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12 and 14-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper Not(s)/Vail Data	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application
	ction Summary Pa	art of Paper No./Mail Date 20110113

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-8, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor et al. (US Patent Number 6449770). Taylor discloses a vehicle safety device wearable on the torso of a person, the device comprising: a body (10) with front and back portions (13, 14), a plurality of releasable straps (20, 24) on the front portion and capable of receiving a vehicle seat belt, and a neck hole (15) wherein at least one strap (20) is mounted to a waist portion of the front portion and at least one strap (24) is mounted to a shoulder portion of the front portion, each strap includes a releasable clip (hook and eye fasteners; see for example column 4 lines 27-32 and 62-66) coupled to one end thereof and configured to mate with another clip to retain the seat belt against the safety device, each strap is fixedly connected to the body, the body is made from strengthened synthetic fabric, the body is sleeveless, the front and back portions are formed in a single piece, the straps are positioned on the device to be capable of accommodating a diagonally extending strap of the seat belt, and at least one strap is positioned near a portion of the body to guide the seat belt away from the

neck hole (it is noted that this is a functional recitation, and the straps are *capable* of a receiving a diagonally extending seat belt strap).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Holder (US Patent Number 4571000). Taylor discloses a safety device as recited in claim 1 as explained above including removable fabric straps, the body including a pair of arm holes (19), and the releasable clip having a hook and eye fastener positioned below each arm hole, but Taylor does not disclose eyelets or removably attached sides. Holder shows a similar safety device wherein the device has a body (10) with front and rear portions (16, 17), eyelets (32) on the body, fabric straps (28) connected to the body through the eyelets, a pair of arm holes, and a side below each arm hole such that the front and rear portions are removably attached down the sides of the body by a releasable clip (36, 38). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Taylor's device to include eyelets and removable sides as taught by Holder because the eyelets and side configuration would allow the device to be placed over the head and arms of the user more easily and connected in place to enhance comfort and ensure safety.

Art Unit: 3636

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Reinhardt (US Patent Number 3742945). Taylor discloses a safety device that is basically the same as that recited in claim 9 except that the body lacks a fixed connection of the front and back portion at the shoulder section only. Reinhardt shows a safety device similar to Taylor wherein the device has a body (30) with front and rear portions only fixedly connected at a shoulder section. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Taylor's device such that the body's front and back portions were fixedly connected at a shoulder section only, as taught by Reinhardt because this could allow for adjustment of the device around the waist of the user enhancing comfort and safety.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Bimboese-Oswald (German Patent Number 3301385). Taylor discloses a safety device as recited in claim 1 as explained above, but does not disclose a waist strap oriented diagonally with respect to a bottom edge. Bimboese-Oswald shows a safety device similar to Taylor wherein the device has a body (1) and an attachment device (9, 10) at the waist portion of the body's front portion that is disposed diagonally with respect to a bottom edge of the device. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modified Taylor's safety device to include a diagonally disposed waist strap as taught by Bimboese-Oswald because such an arrangement could provide anatomically better-positioned seatbelt holders along the user's waist. Moreover, it is simply a matter of common sense that the diagonal waist straps could be used to address the known problem of well-positioned seatbelts for a user riding in a

Art Unit: 3636

vehicle. It is clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would have perceived a reasonable expectation of success as a result of combing the diagonal waist straps of Bimboese-Oswald with the safety device of Taylor.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 27 December 2010, with respect to the 35 USC 112 claim rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112 claim rejections have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 27 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, Applicant argues that the Taylor and Bimboese-Oswald references do not disclose straps positioned to accommodate a diagonally extending seat belt strap. It is maintained however, that regardless of the intended method of operation of the references, they are clearly capable of operating as claimed and accommodating a diagonal strap within their releasable straps. A user could easily insert a diagonal seat belt strap through both the shoulder and waist straps of the reference devices. Accordingly, the cited references are viewed as disclosing all of the claimed limitations as currently written as explained in the rejections above.

The remainder of Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 3636

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This includes Sweger (US Patent Number 5213366).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Gabler whose telephone number is (571) 272-2155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DAVID DUNN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3636

PG 1/13/2011